

2 *Tracts* THE 19803 46
DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY
AND
TRANSUBSTANTIATION

COMPARED,

AS TO

Scripture, Reason, and Tradition.

In a New DIALOGUE between a
Protestant and a Papist.

The First Part. (2nd)

WHEREIN

An ANSWER is given to the late Proofs of the Anti-
quity of *Transubstantiation*, in the Books called
Consensus Veterum, and *Nubes Testium*, &c.

St. Millington 37

IMPRIMATUR.

Ex Aedib. Lambeth.
Jan. 17. 1686.

Gül. Needham RR. in Christo Pat. ac D.
D. Wilhelmo Archiep. Cant. a Sacris.

LONDON, Printed by J. D. for W. Rogers at the Sun over
against St. Dunstons Church in Fleet-street, MDC LXXX VII.



231

Ref 265-3

ends

2000

TRANSISTATION

COMPARED

AS TO

Scripture, Reason, and Tradition

In a New DIALOGUE between
Protestant and a Catholic

W. H. L. L.


THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION
125 WEST 4TH STREET
NEW YORK

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION
125 WEST 4TH STREET
NEW YORK

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION
125 WEST 4TH STREET
NEW YORK

2000

The Doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation compared, as to Scripture, Reason, and Tradition. In a New Dialogue between a Protestant and a Papist.

Pr.  Remember your last Words at parting were, *Farewell ; and God give his holy Spirit to instruct you.* Which have run much in my Mind : For if the *holy Spirit instruct us*, what need is there of an Infallible Church ? I hope those were not only words of course with you.

Pa. No ; but I meant that the *holy Spirit should instruct you* about the Authority of the Church.

Pr. Was this indeed your meaning ? Then you would have me believe the Church Infallible, because the *holy Spirit* which is *Infallible* will instruct me about it, if I seek his Directions.

P. Yes.

Pr. But then I have no Reason to believe it : for the *holy Spirit* after my seeking *his Instructions*, teaches me otherwise. And if the *holy Spirit* is Infallible which way soever it teaches, then I am *infallibly sure* there is no such thing as *Infallibility* in what you call the *Catholick Church*.

P. Come, come ; you make too much of a sudden Expression at parting ; I pray let us return to our main business, which is to shew, that there is *the same Ground from*

Scripture, Reason, and Tradition, to believe Transubstantiation, as there is to believe the Trinity. And this I affirm again, after reading the *Answers* to the former *Dialogue*; and I now come somewhat better prepared to make it out.

Pr. So you had need. And I hope I shall be able not only to defend the contrary, but to make it evident to you that there is a mighty difference in these two Doctrines, as to *Scripture, Reason, and Tradition.* But I pray keep close to the Point: for I hate impertinent trifling in a Debate of such consequence.

P. I must confess I over-shot my self a little in the former Dialogue, when I offer'd to prove the Doctrine of the *Trinity unreasonable and absurd*: For no Church can make such a Doctrine, which is unreasonable and absurd in it self, not to be so to me; No Church can make *three and one to be the same, if they be repugnant in themselves.* But my meaning was, that Mens Disputes about these things will never be ended, till they submit to the *Authority of the Church.*

Pr. And then they may believe *three, or three hundred Persons in the Trinity*, as the Church pleases. Is that your meaning?

P. No. But I said to my *Carnal Reason* it would appear so; but not to my Reason as under the Conduct of an *Infallible Guide.*

Pr. Then an *Infallible Guide* can make *three hundred to be but three*; which is a notable trick of Infallibility.

P. No; I tell you I meant only that we are not to follow *Carnal Reason*, but the *Church's Authority*; i.e. we are not to search into Mysteries above Reason, but only believe what the Church delivers. And I intend now to argue the Point somewhat closely with you. Do you believe that there are any Mysteries in the Christian Doctrine above Reason or not? If not, you must reject the *Trinity*; if you do, then you have no ground for reject-
ing

ing *Transubstantiation* because it is above Reason.

Pr. You clearly mistake us; and I perceive were very little acquainted with our Doctrine; for we do not reject any Doctrine concerning God, meerly because it is above our Reason, when it is otherwise clearly proved from Scripture. For then we own our selves bound to submit in matters of Divine Revelation concerning an Infinite Being, though they be above our Capacity to comprehend them. But in matters of a *finite Nature*, which are far more easie for us to conceive, and which depend upon the Evidence of Sense, we may justly reject any Doctrine which overthrows that Evidence, and is not barely *above our Reason*, but *repugnant* to it.

P. I do not well understand you.

Pr. So I believe; but I will endeavour to help your Understanding a little. And I pray consider these things.

1. That there is a great difference in our Conceptions of *Finite* and *Infinite* Beings. For, whatsoever is *Infinite*, is thereby owned to be above our Comprehension, otherwise it would not be Infinite. The Attributes of God which are essential to him, as his Wisdom, Goodness and Power, must be understood by us, so far as to form a true Notion of that Being which is Infinite; but then the *Infinity* of these Attributes is above our reach. And so his *Infinite Duration*, which we call *Eternity*; his Infinite Presence which we call his *Immensity*; the *Infinite Extent* of his *Knowledge*, as to future Contingencies; all these must be confessed to be *Mysteries*, not above our Reason, but above our Capacity. For we have great Reason to own them, but we have not Faculties to comprehend them. We cannot believe a God, unless we hold him to be Infinite in all Perfections; and if he be Infinite, he must be incomprehensible; so that Religion must be overthrown if something incomprehensible be not allowed. And as to finite Beings, so far as they run into what we

we call *Infinite*, they are so far out of our reach; as appears by the insuperable Difficulties about the Infinite Divisibility of Quantity.

2. That we have certain Notions of some things in the visible World; both that they are, and that they have some Attributes essential to them. We daily converse with things visible and corporeal; and if we do not conceive something true and certain in our Minds about them, we live in a Dream and have only Phantasms and Illusions about us. If we are certain that there are real Bodies, and not meer Appearances, there must be some certain way of conveying such Impressions to our Minds, from whence they may conclude, this is a Horse, and this a Man, and this is Flesh, and this Blood, and this is Wood, and this Stone; otherwise all certainty is gone, and we must turn meer Scepticks.

3. That in examining the sense of Scripture we may make use of those certain Notions of visible things which God and Nature have planted in us; otherwise we are not dealt vvith as Reasonable Creatures. And therefore vve must use those Faculties God hath given us, in reading and comparing Scriptures, and examining the sense that is offered by such Notions which are agreeable to the nature of things. As for instance, the Scripture frequently attributes *Eyes* and *Ears* and *Hands* to the *Almighty*: must we presently believe God to have an Human Shape because of this? No; we compare these with the necessary Attributes of God, and from thence see a necessity of interpreting these Expressions in a Sense agreeable to the Divine Nature. So if other Expressions of *Scripture* seem to affirm that of a *Body* which is inconsistent with the Nature of it; as, that it is not visible, or may be in many Places at once, there is some Reason for me to understand them in a Sense agreeable to the Essential Properties of a Body.

4. There

4. There is a difference between our not apprehending the manner how a thing is, and the apprehending the impossibility of the thing it self. And this is the meaning of the distinction of Things *above our Reason*, and *contrary to our Reason*. If the Question be, how the same individual Nature can be communicated to three distinct Persons? We may justly answer, we cannot apprehend the manner of it, no more than we can the *Divine Immensity*, or an *Infinite Amplitude* without *Extension*. But if any go about to prove there is an impossibility in the thing, he must prove that the Divine Nature can communicate it self no otherwise than a finite individual Nature can: For all acknowledg the same common Nature may be communicated to three Persons, and so the whole Controversy rests on this single Point as to Reason; whether the Divine Nature and Persons are to be judged and measured as Human Nature and Persons are. And in this, I think we have the advantage in point of Reason of the *Antitrinitarians* themselves, altho they pretend never so much to it.

P. Good night, Sir; I perceive you are in for an hour; and I have not so much time to spare, to hear such long Preachments. For my part, talk of *Sense* and *Reason* as long as you will, I am for the *Catholick Church*.

Pr. And truly, she is mightily obliged to you for opposing her *Authority* to *Sense* and *Reason*.

P. Call it what you will, I am for the *Churches Authority*; and the talk of *Sense* and *Reason* is but *Canting* without that.

Pr. The matter is then come to a fine pass; I thought *Canting* had rather been that which was spoken against *Sense* or *Reason*. But I pray, Sir, what say you to what I have been discoursing?

P. To tell you truth, I did not mind it; for as soon as I heard whither you were going, I clapt fast hold of the Church,

Church, as a Man would do of a Mast in a Storm, and resolved not to let go my hold.

Pr. What ! altho you should sink together with it.

P. If I do, the Church must answer for it; for I must sink or swim with it.

Pr. What Comfort will that be to you, when you are called to an account for your self? But if you stick here, it is to no purpose to talk any more with you.

P. I think so too. But now we are in, methinks we should not give over thus; especially since I began this Dialogue about the *Trinity* and *Transubstantiation*.

Pr. If you do, we know the Reason of it. But I am resolved to push this matter now as far as it will go; and either to convince you of your Mistake, or at least to make you give it over wholly.

P. But if I must go on in my Parallel, I will proceed in my own way. I mentioned three things, *Scripture, Reason, and Tradition*. And I will begin with *Tradition*.

Pr. This is somewhat an uncouth Method; but I must be content to follow your Conduct.

P. No, Sir, the Method is very natural; for in *Mysteries above Reason, the safest way is to trust Tradition*. And none can give so good account of that as the Church.

Pr. Take your own way: but I perceive *Tradition* with you is the *Sense of the present Church*; which is as hard to conceive, as that a *Nunc stans* should be an eternal Succession.

P. As to comparing *Tradition*, I say, that the *Mystery of the Trinity* was questioned in the very Infancy of the Church, and the *Arians* prevailed much against it in the beginning of the fourth Age; but *Transubstantiation* lay unquestion'd and quiet for a long time; and when it came into debate, there was no such opposition as that of *Arius*, to call in question the Authority of its *Tradition*; the Church received it unanimously, and in that Sense continued till rash Reason attempted to fathom the unlimited Miracles and Mysteries of God

Pr.

Pr. I stand amazed at the boldness of this Assertion: But I find your present Writers are very little vers'd in *Antiquity*; which makes them offer things concerning the Ancient Church, especially as to *Transubstantiation*, which those who had been modest and learned, would have been ashamed of.

P. I hope I may make use of them to justify my self, tho you slight them, I mean the *Consensus Veterum*, the *Nubes Testium*, and the single Sheet about *Transubstantiation*.

Pr. Take them all, and as many more as you please, I am sure you can never prove *Transubstantiation* to have been, and the *Trinity* not to have been the constant Belief of the Primitive Church.

P. Let me manage my own Argument first.

Pr. All the Reason in the World.

P. My Argument is, *That the Doctrine of the Trinity met with far more opposition than Transubstantiation did.*

Pr. Good Reason for it, because it was never heard of then. You may as well say, the *Tradition* of the Circulation of the Blood lay very quiet, from the days of *Hippocrates* to the time of *Parissanus*. Who was there that opposed things before they were thought of?

P. That is your great Mistake; for *Transubstantiation* was very well known, but they did not happen to speak so much of it, because it was not opposed.

Pr. But how is it possible for you to know it was so well known, if they spake not of it?

P. I did not say, they did not speak of it, but not so much, or not half so expressly; because it is not customary for Men to argue unquestionable Truths.

Pr. But still how shall it be known that the Church received this Doctrine *unanimously*, if they do not speak expressly of it? But since you offer at no Proof of your Assertion, I will make a fair offer to you, and undertake to prove, that the Fathers spake expressly against it.

B

P.

P. How is that? *Expressly against it?* God forbid.

Pr. Make of it what you please, and answer what you can: I begin with my Proofs.

P. Nay, then, we are in for all night. I am now full of business and cannot hearken to tedious Proofs out of the Fathers, which have been canvassed a hundred times.

Pr. I will be as short as I can; and I promise you not to transcribe any that have hitherto written, nor to urge you with any spurious Writer, or lame Citation at second or third hand; and I shall produce nothing but what I have read, considered, and weighed in the *Authors themselves*.

P. Since it must be so; let me hear your doughty Arguments, which I cannot as well turn against the *Trinity*; For that is my Point.

Pr. I leave you to try your Skill upon them. The first shall be from the Proofs of the Truth of *Christ's Incarnation*; and I hope this will not hold against the *Trinity*. And those Arguments which they brought to prove *Christ Incarnate*, do overthrow *Transubstantiation* effectually. So that either we must make the Fathers to reason very ill against *Hereticks*; or, if their Arguments be good, it was impossible they should believe *Transubstantiation*. For can you suppose that any can believe it, who should not barely assert, but make the force of an Argument to lie in this, that the substance of the Bread doth not remain after Consecration? And this I now prove, not from any slight inconsiderable Authors, but from some of the greatest Men in the Church in their time. I begin with St. *Chrysostom*, whose Epistle to *Casarius* is at last brought to light by a learned Person of the Roman Communion; who makes no question of the Sincerity of it, and saith, *the Latin Translation which only he could find entire, was about five hundred years old*; but he hath so confirm'd it by the *Greek Fragments* of it, quoted by ancient Greek Authors, that there can be no suspicion left concerning it.

P.

P. What means all this ado before you come to the Point?

Pr. Because this *Epistle* hath been formerly so confidently denied to be St. *Chrysostom's*; and such care was lately taken to suppress it.

P. But what will you do with it now you have it?

Pr. I will tell you presently. This *Epistle* was written by him for the satisfaction of *Casarius* a Monk, who was in danger of being seduced by the *Apollinarists*.

P. What have we to do with the *Apollinarists*? Do you think all hard words are akin, and so the affinity rises between *Apollinarists* and *Transubstantiation*?

Pr. You shall find it comes nearer the matter than you imagined. For those *Hereticks* denied the Truth of the Human Nature of Christ after the Union, and said that the Properties of it did then belong to the *Divine Nature*; as appears by that very *Epistle*.

P. And what of all this? Do we deny the truth of Christ's Human Nature?

Pr. No; but I pray observe the force of his Parallel.

He is proving that each *Nature* in Christ contains its properties: for, saith he, as before Consecration we call it Bread, but after it by Divine Grace sanctifying it through the Prayer of the Priest, it is no longer called Bread, but the Body of our Lord, altho the nature of Bread remains in it; and it doth not become two Bodies, but one Body of Christ; so here the Divine Nature being joyned to the Human, they both make one Son, and one Person.

Sicut enim antequam sanctificatur panis, panem nominamus, divinâ autem illum sanctificante Gratiâ, mediante Sacerdote, liberatus est quidem ab appellatione panis, dignus autem habitus est Dominici Corporis appellatione, etiam si natura Panis in ipso permanfit & non duo Corpora, sed unum Corpus Filii prædicatur, sic & hic divina *epistola* (evidens quæ in Græc. Exemplar. Ep. Bigot.) id est inundante Corporis Natura unum Filium, unam Personam utraq; hæc fecerunt.

P. And what do you infer from hence?

Pr. Nothing more, but that the Nature of Bread doth as certainly remain after Consecration, as the Nature of Christ doth after the Union.

Papist Misre-
presented, and
Represented,
2 Part. ch. 3.
p. 23.

P. Hold a little. For the Author of the single Sheet faith, *That the Fathers by Nature and Substance do often mean no more than the natural Qualities, or visible Appearances of Things.* And why may not St. Chrysostom mean so here?

Pr. I say, it is impossible he should. For all the Dispute was about *the Substance*, and not about *the Qualities*, as appears by that very Epistle; for those Hereticks granted, that Christ had all the *Properties* of a Body left still; they do not deny that Christ could suffer, but they said, the *Properties* of a Body after the Union belonged to the *Divine Nature*, the *Human Nature* being swallowed up by the Union. And therefore St. Chrysostom, by *Nature*, must understand *Substance*, and not *Qualities*; or else he doth by no means prove that which he aimed at. So that St. Chrysostom doth manifestly assert the *Substance* of the Bread to remain after Consecration.

P. But doth not St. Chrysostom suppose then, that upon Consecration, *The Bread is united to the Divinity, as the Human Nature is to the Divine*; else what Parallet could he make?

Pr. I will deal freely with you by declaring, that not St. Chrysostom only, but many others of the *Fathers*, did own the Bread after Consecration to be made *the real Body of Christ*; but not in your Sense, by changing the *Substance* of the *Elements* into that Body of Christ which is in Heaven; but by a *Mystical Union*, caused by the *Holy Spirit*, whereby the Bread becomes *the Body of Christ*, as that was which was conceived in the Womb of the Blessed Virgin. But this is quite another thing from *Transubstantiation*; and the Church of *England* owns, that after Consecration, *the Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood of Christ*.

P. But altho this be not *Transubstantiation*, it may be something as hard to believe or understand.

Pr.

Pr. By no means. For all the difficulties relating to the taking away the *Substance* of the Bread, and the *Properties* of Christ's Body are removed by this *Hypothesis*.

P. Let us then keep to our Point : but methinks this is but a slender appearance yet ; *St. Chrysostom* stands alone for all that I see.

Pr. Have but a little Patience, and you shall see more of his mind presently. But I must first tell you, that the *Eutychians* afterwards were condemned in the Council of *Chalcedon* for following this Doctrine of *Apollinaris* ; and that Council defines, *that the differences of the two Natures in Christ were not destroyed by the Union ; but that their Properties were preserved distinct and concur to one Person.* And against these, the other Fathers disputed just as *St. Chrysostom* had done before against the *Apollinarists*. Concil. Chalced. Act. 5.

Theodoret brings the same Instance, and he affirms expressly, *That the Nature of the Elements is not changed, that they do not lose their proper Nature, but remain in their former Substance, Figure and Form, and may be seen and touched as before.*

Still this is not to prove any *Accidental Qualities*, but the very *Substance* of Christ's Body to remain.

P. But was not *Theodoret* a Man of suspected Faith in the Church ? and therefore no great matter can be made of his Testimony.

Pr. Yeild it then to us ; and see if we do not clear *Theodoret* ; but your own learned Men never question him, as to this matter (at least) and the ancient Church hath vindicated his Reputation. And he saith no more than *St. Chrysostom* before him, and others of great Esteem after him.

P. Who were they ?

Ὁ δὲ δὴ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὰ οἷον καὶ ἀπὸν
προσώπων, καὶ ἀπὸ πλὴν αὐτῶν ἀμ-
πλὴν ὁμοιωσιν, ὅτι τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς σὺν-
εἶναι τὸ εἶναι αὐτῶν ὁμοιωσιν, τὴν
ἀλλοίωσιν, καὶ τὴν αὐτῶν μεταβολὴν ἀλλὰ τὴν
ἑαυτῶν τὸ εἶναι προσώπων. Dial. 1.
Οὐδὲ δὲ μὴ δὲ ἄλλοι τὴν αὐτῶν
σὺν εἶναι τὴν ἀλλοίωσιν ἐξ ἑαυτῶν αὐτῶν μὴ
καὶ ὅτι τὸ εἶναι αὐτῶν ὁμοιωσιν, καὶ τὸ εἶναι
αὐτῶν, καὶ τὸ εἶναι αὐτῶν, καὶ τὸ εἶναι
αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ εἶναι αὐτῶν. Dial. 2.

Pr.

Pr. What say you to a *Pope*, whom you account *Head of the Church*? *Pope Gelasius* writing against the same

Certe Sacramenta quæ sumimus Corporis & Sanguinis Domini divina res est, propter quod & per eadem divina efficiuntur consortes Naturæ, & tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura Panis & Vini. *Gelas. in Biblioth. Patr. To. 4.*

Hereticks, produces the same Example, and he expressly saith, *The Substance of the Bread and Wine doth not cease.*

P. I thought I should find you tripping. Here you put a Fob-head of the Church upon us. For the Author of

pag. 20.

the single Sheet saith, *this was another Gelasius, as is prov'd at large by Bellarmin.*

Pr. In truth, I am ashamed of the Ignorance of such small Authors, who will be meddling with things they understand not. For this Writer, since *Bellarmin's* time, hath been evidently proved from Testimonies of Antiquity, such as *Fulgentius* and *John* the second, to have been *Pope Gelasius*, and that by some of the most learned Persons of the Roman Communion, such as Cardinal *Du Perron*, *Petavius*, *Sirmondus*, and others.

P. Have you any more that talk at this rate?

Pr. Yes. What think you of a *Patriarch of Antioch*, who useth the same Similitude for the same purpose; and

Οὐκ ἔστι τὸ πρῶτον λαμβανόμενον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας ἐκ ἐξίστασαι καὶ τῆς νοητῆς ἀδιαίρετον μένει καὶ εἰς ὅσον. *Ephrazm. Antioch. ap. Phot. Cod. 229.*

he affirms, that the sensible Substance still continues in the Eucharist, tho it hath Divine Grace joyned with it? And I pray, now tell me seriously, did the Tradition of Transubstantiation lie

unquestion'd and quiet all this while? when we have three Patriarchs, of *Constantinople*, *Rome*, and *Antioch*, expressly against it; and one of them owned by your Selves, to be Head of the Church; and held by many to be Infallible, especially when he teaches the Church; which he doth, if ever, when he declares against Hereticks.

P. I know not what to say, unless by *Nature and Substance they meant Qualities and Properties.*

Pr. I have evidently proved that could not be their meaning.

P.

P. But I am told Monsieur *Arnaud* in his elaborate Defence against *Claude* goes that way, and he saith, *The Eutychians and Apollinarists did not absolutely deny any Substance to remain in Christ's Body, but not so as to be endued with such Properties as ours have.*

Tom. 3. l. 5. c.
1, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11.

Pr. I grant this is the main of his Defence; but I confess, Monsieur *Arnaud* hath not so much Authority with me, as a General Council which declared the contrary; viz. *That the Eutychians were condemned for not holding two Substances or Natures in Christ after the Union.* And

Ap. Facund.
l. 8. c. 5.

Domnus Antiochenus, who first laid open the Eutychian Heresy, saith, *It lay in making a mixture and confusion of both Natures in Christ, and so making the Divinity passible:* and to the same purpose others. There were some who

Ap. Canif.
Antiq. Lection.
To. 4. p. 112,
114, 127.

charged both *Apollinaris* and *Eutyches* with holding, *that Christ brought his Body from Heaven, and that it was not con-substantial with ours*; but *Apollinaris* himself, in the Fragments preserved by *Leontius*, not only denies it, but pronounces an Anathema against those that hold it. And *Vitalis* of *Antioch* a great Disciple of his, in discourse with

Epiph. hær. 77.
Vincent. Com-
mon. Aug. de
Hæres. c. 55.

Epiphanius, utterly denied a Cælestial Body in Christ. *Vincentius Lerinensis* saith, *his Heresy lay in denying two distinct Substances in Christ.* *St. Augustin* saith, *he held but one Substance after the Union*; so that he must deny any

Substance of a Body to remain after the Union, which he asserted to be wholly swallowed up, and the Properties to continue: Which was another kind of Transubstantiation; for no more of the Substance of Christ's Body was supposed to remain after the Union, than there is supposed to be in the Elements after Consecration. But in both Cases the

Concil. Chal-
ced. Act. 1.

Properties and Qualities were the same still. And it is observable, that in the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, *Eutyches* rejected it, as a Calumny cast upon him, that he should hold that Christ brought a Body from Heaven. But the Eutychian Doctrine lay in taking away the Substance of the

Theodor. Dial.
1. & 2.

the Body, and making the *Divinity* the sole *Substance*, but with the *Accidents* and *Properties* of the Body. And for this they produced the Words of St. John, *The Word was made Flesh*; which they urged with the same Confidence that you now do, *This is my Body*. And when they were urged with Difficulties; they made the very same recourse to *God's Omnipotency*, and the *Letter of Scripture*, and made the same Declamations against the *use of Reason* that you do; and withal, they would not have the Human Nature to be annihilated, but to be changed into the Divine; just as your Authors do about the *Substance* of the Bread. So that it is hard to imagine a more exact Parallel to *Transubstantiation* than there is in this Doctrine; and consequently there can be no more evident Proof of it, than the Fathers making use of the Instance of the *Eucharist*, to shew, that as the *Substance* of Bread doth remain after *Consecration*; so the *Substance* of *Christ's Body* doth continue after the Union. And when the Fathers from the remaining *Properties* do prove the *Substance* to remain, they overthrow the possibility of *Transubstantiation*. For, if they might be without the *Substance*, their whole Argument loses its force, and proves just nothing.

P. But all this proves nothing as to the *Faith* of the *Church*; being only Arguments used by *Divines* in the heat of *Disputes*.

Pr. Do you then in earnest give up the Fathers as *Disputants* to us; but retain them as *Believers* to your selves? But how should we know their *Faith* but by their *Works*?

P. I perceive you have a mind to be pleasant; but my meaning was, that in *Disputes* Men may easily overshoot themselves, and use ineffectual Arguments.

Pr. But is it possible to suppose they should draw Arguments from something against the *Faith* of the *Church*? As for instance; Suppose now we are disputing about *Transubstantiation*, I should bring an Argument from the
Human

Human Nature of Christ, and say, That as in the Hypothetical Union the Substance is changed, and nothing but the Accidents remain; so it is in the Elements upon Consecration. Do you think I should not presently deny your Example, and say, your very Supposition is *Heretical*? So no doubt would the *Eutychians* have done in case the Faith of the Church had then been, that the Substance of the Elements was changed after Consecration. And the *Eutychians* were the most sottish Disputants in the World, if they had not brought the Doctrine of Transubstantiation to prove their *Heresie*.

P. Methinks you are very long upon this Argument; when shall we have done at this rate?

Pr. I take this for your best Answer; and so I proceed to a second Argument, which I am sure will not hold against the Trinity; and that is from the natural and inseparable Properties of Christ's Body; which are utterly inconsistent with the belief of Transubstantiation. And the force of the Argument in general lies in this, That the Fathers did attribute such things to the Body of Christ, which render it incapable of being present in such a manner in the Sacrament as Transubstantiation supposes. And no Men who understand themselves, will assert that at one time, which they must be bound to deny at another; but they will be sure to make an Exception or Limitation, which may reconcile both together. As if you should say, That the Body of Christ cannot be in more places than one at once, upon the Doctrine of St. Thomas; ye would presently add, with regard to the Sacrament, i. e. not in regard of its natural Presence, but in a Sacramental it may: So, if the Fathers had an Opinion like yours as to the Body of Christ, they would have a Reserve, or Exception, as to the Sacrament. But it appears by their Writings, that they attribute such Properties in general to the Body of Christ, as overthrow any such Presence, without Exceptions or Li-

mitations. But that is not all: For I shall now prove,

1. That they do ~~not~~ attribute *Circumscription* to *Christ's Body in Heaven*, so as to exclude the possibility of its being upon Earth.

2. That they deny any such thing as *the Supernatural Existence of a Body after the manner of a Spirit*.

P. What do you mean? I am quite tired already; and now you are turning up the other Glass.

Pr. Since you will be dabling in these Controversies, you must not think to escape so easily. I have been not a little offended at the Insolence of some late *Pamphlets* upon this Argument; and now I come to *close Reasoning*, you would fain be gone.

P. I am in a little haste at present; I pray come quickly to the Point.

Pr. As soon as you please. What think you, if a Man now should bring an Argument to prove a matter of Faith from hence, *That Christ's Body could not be in Heaven and Earth at once*, would this Argument hold good? Yet thus *Vigilius Tapsitanus* argues against those who denied two Na-

tures in Christ; for, saith he, *The Body of Christ when it was on Earth, was not in Heaven; and now it is in Heaven it is not upon Earth; and it is so far from being so, that we expect him to come from Heaven in his Fleish, whom we believe to be now present on Earth by his Divinity*. How can this hold, if the

Nam quando in Terra fuit, non erat ubiq; in Cœlo. Et nunc quia in Cœlo est, non est ubiq; in Terra, & in tantum non est, ut secundum ipsam (Carnem) Christum spectemus, esse venturum de Cœlo, quem secundum verbum nobiscum esse credimus in terrâ. *Cont. Eutyb. l. 4. n. 14.*

Body of Christ can be in Heaven and Earth at the same time?

P. He speaks this of the *Natural Presence* of Christ's Body, and not of *the Sacramental*.

Pr. The Argument is not drawn from the *manner* of the *Presence*, but from the *Nature* of a *Body*, that it could not be in Heaven and Earth at the same time. And so

St

St. *Augustin* said, that *Christ* was every where present as God; but confined to a certain place in Heaven according to the Measure of his true Body.

Et ubique totam presentem esse non dubites tanquam Deum ----- & in loco aliquo Cœli propter veri Corporis modum. Ad Dardan.

P. This is only to disprove the *Ubiquity* of *Christ's* Body; and not his being in several places at the same time.

Pr. Then you yeild it to be repugnant to the Nature of a Body to be every where present.

P. Yes.

Pr. But what if there be as great a repugnancy from St. *Augustin's* Argument, for a Body to be present in several places at once?

P. I see no such thing.

Pr. No? His Argument is from the Confinement of a true Body to a certain place. And if it be in many places at once, it is as far from being confined, as if it took up all places. And there are some greater Difficulties as to a Body's being distant from it self, than in asserting its *Ubiquity*.

P. I perceive you are inclined to be a *Lutheran*.

Pr. No such matter. For I think the Essential Properties of a Finite and Infinite Being are incommunicable to each other, and I look on *Ubiquity* as one of them.

P. Then the same Argument will not hold as to Presence in several places, for this is no Infinite Perfection.

Pr. You run from one Argument to another. For these are two distinct ways of arguing; and the Argument from the Repugnancy of it to the Nature of a Body, doth as well hold against *Ubiquity*, as that it is a Divine Perfection. And St. *Augustin* in that excellent Epistle doth argue from the Essential Properties and Dimensions of Bodies, and the difference of the Presence of a Spirit and a Body. I pray read and consider that Epistle, and you will think it impossible St. *Augustin* should believe Transubstantiation.

P. St. *Augustin* was a great Disputant, and such are wont while they are eager upon one Point, to forget another. But St. *Augustin* elsewhere doth assert the *Presence of Christ's real Body* in the *Sacrament*.

Pr. Then the plain Consequence is, that he contradicted himself.

P. But he doth not speak of a *Sacramental Presence*.

Pr. What again? But St. *Augustin* makes this an essential difference between a *Divine* and *Corporal Presence*; that *the one doth not fill places by its Dimensions as the other doth*; so that Bodies cannot be in distant places at once. What think you of this?

Non enim Corpora sunt quorum amplior sit in tribus quam in singulis magnitudo, nec loca suis molibus tenent, ut distantibus spatiis simul esse non possint. Ad Dardan.

P. I pray go on.

Pr. What think you of the *Manichees* Doctrine, who held that *Christ was in the Sun and Moon when he suffered on the Cross*? Was this possible or not?

P. What would you draw from hence?

Pr. Nothing more, but that St. *Augustin* disproved it, because his Body could not be at the same time in the Sun and Moon, and upon Earth?

Secundum presentiam verò corporalem simul & in Sole & in Luna & in Cruce esse non posset. C. *Faust*. li. 20. c. 11.

P. As to the ordinary course of Nature, St. *Augustin's* Argument holds, but not as to the *Miraculous Power of God*.

Pr. There is a difference between the *ordinary Course of Nature*, and the *unchangeable Order of Nature*.

P. Let me hear this again; for it is new Doctrine to us.

Pr. That's strange! Those things are by the *ordinary Course of Nature*, which cannot be changed but by Divine Power; but imply no repugnancy for God to alter that Course; but those are by the *unchangeable order of Nature*,

Nature, which cannot be done without overthrowing the very Nature of the things; and such things are impossible in themselves, and therefore God himself cannot do them.

P. It seems then you set Bounds to God's Omnipotency.

Pr. Doth not the Scripture say, *there are some things impossible for God to do*?

P. Yes; such as are repugnant to his own Perfections; as it is impossible for God to lie.

Pr. But are there no other things impossible to be done? What think you of making the time past not to be past?

P. That is impossible in it self.

Pr. But is it not impossible for the same Body to be in two different times?

P. Yes.

Pr. Why not then in two or more different Places; since a Body is as certainly confined, as to Place, as it is to Time?

P. You are run now into the Point of Reason, when we were upon St. *Augustin's* Testimony.

Pr. But I say, St. *Augustin* went upon this ground, that it was repugnant to the Nature of a Body to be in more places than one at the same time. And so likewise *Cassian* proves, *That when Christ was upon Earth he could not be in Heaven, but in regard of his Divinity.* Is there not the same Repugnancy for a Body in

Et cum in Terra loquitur in Cœlo utiq; nisi per Dei Infinitatem esse non possit. De Incarn. l. 4. c. 6.

Heaven,

Heaven to be upon Earth, as for a Body upon Earth to be in Heaven?

P. These are new Questions, which I have not met with in our Writers, and therefore I shall take time to answer them. But all these Testimonies proceed upon a Body considered under the *Nature of a Body*; but in the Sacrament we consider *Christ's Body as present after the manner of a Spirit*.

Pr. That was the next thing I promised to prove from the *Fathers*, that they knew of no such thing, and therefore could not believe your Doctrine. Have you observed what the *Fathers* say about the difference of *Body and Spirit*?

P. Not I; but I have read our Authors, who produce them for our Doctrine.

Pr. That is the perpetual fault of your Writers, to attend more to the *sound* of their *Words*, than to the *force* of their *Reasonings*. They bring places out of *Popular Discourses* intended to heighten the Peoples Devotion, and never compare them with those *Principles* which they assert, when they come to Reasoning; which would plainly shew their other Expressions are to be understood in a *Mystical and Figurative Sense*. But I pray tell me, do you think the *Fathers* had no distinct Notion of a *Body and Spirit*, and the *Essential Properties* of both?

P. Yes doubtless.

Pr. Suppose then they made those to lie in such things as are inconsistent with *the Presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament after the manner of a Spirit*; do you think then

then they could hold it to be so present? And if they did not, they could not belive *Transubstantiation*.

P. Very true.

Pr. What think you then of St. *Augustin*, who makes it impossible for a Body to be without its Dimensions and Extension of Parts? But you assert a Body may be without them; or else it cannot be after *the manner of a Spirit*, as you say it is in the Sacrament.

P. I pray shew that St. *Augustin* made it inconsistent with the Nature of a Body to be otherwise.

Pr. He saith, *That all Bodies how gross or subtle soever they be, can never be all every where (i. e. cannot be indivisibly present after the manner of a Spirit) but must be extended according to their several Parts, and whether great or little, must take up a space, and so fill the Place, that it cannot be all in any one Part.* Is this possible to be reconciled with your Notion of a Body being present after *the manner of a Spirit*?

Sive ista crassiora, si-
ve subtiliora
sed tamen
Corpora,
quorum nul-
lum potest
esse ubique
totum, quo-
niam per innumerabiles partes aliud alibi habeat necesse est. Et quantumcunq;
sit Corpus, seu quantulumcunque corpusculum, loci occupet spatium, eun-
demque locum sic impleat, ut in nullâ ejus parte sit totum. Ad Volusian.

P. To be present after the manner of a Spirit is with us, to be so present, as *not to be extended*, and to be whole in every part.

Pr. But this St. *Augustin* saith, *no Body can be*; and not only there, but elsewhere he saith, *Take away Dimensions from Bodies, and they are no longer Bodies.* And
that

Quantum *that a greater part takes up a greater space, and a lesser*
 si hoc demas *a less; and must be always less in the part than in the*
 Corporibus, *whole.*

quantum
 mea opinio est, neq; sentiri possunt, neque omnino Corpora esse rectè existima-
 rem. De Quant. Animæ, c. 4.

Quod per loci spacium aliqua longitudine, latitudine, altitudine ita sistitur
 vel movetur, ut majore sui parte majorem locum occupet, & breviori brevior-
 em minusq; sit in parte quam in toto. Ad Hieron. Ep. 166.

P. But he speaks of *Extension in it self*, and not
 with respect to *Place*.

Pr. That is of *Extension* that is *not extended*; for
 if it be, it must have respect to *Place*; but nothing
 can be plainer, than that *St. Augustin* doth speak with
 respect to *Place*. And he elsewhere saith, *That every*

Non om-
 nino potest *Body must have Place, and be extended in it.*
 esse aliquod

Corpus, sive Cœleste, sive Terrestrè, sive Aereum, sive humidum, quod non
 minus sit in parte quam in toto, neque ullo modo possit in loco hujus partis
 simul habere aliam partem, sed aliud hic aliud alibi habens per quælibet spatia
 locorum distantia & dividua, vel potius ut ita dicam, scetili more distenditur. C.
 Epist. Manich. c. 16.

Omne Corpus locale est, & omne locale Corpus est. 63. Quæst. c. 35.
 Corpus quodlibet per localia spatia porrectum est. 83. Quæst. c. 51.

P. But he doth not speak this of the *Sacrament*.

Pr. But he speaks it of all *Bodies wheresoever pre-
 sent*; and he doth not except *the Sacrament*, which he
 would certainly have done, if he had believed as you do
 concerning it.

P. *St. Augustin* might have particular *Opinions* in
 this, as he had in other things.

Pr.

Pr. So far from it, that I shall make it appear, that this was the general *Sense* of the *Fathers*. *S. Gregory Nazianzen* saith, *That the Nature of Bodies requires, that they have Figure and Shape, and may be touched, and seen, and circumscribed.* *S. Cyril of Alexandria*, saith, *That if God himself were a Body, he must be liable to the properties of Bodies, and he must be in a place, as Bodies are.* And all those *Fathers*, who prove, that *God* cannot be a *Body*, do it from such Arguments as shew, that they knew nothing of a *Bodies* Being after the manner of a *Spirit*: For then the force of their Arguments is lost, which are taken from the *Essential Properties* of a *Body*, such as *Extension*, *Divisibility*, and *Circumscription*. But if a *Body* may be without these, then *God* may be a *Body* after the manner of a *Spirit*; and so the *Spirituality* of the *Divine Nature* will be taken away.

Orat. 34. & in
Ep ad Cledon.
Dial. 2. de
Trin.

P. I never heard these Arguments before, and must take some time to consider.

Pr. The sooner the better; and I am sure if you do, you will repent being a *New Convert*. But I have yet something to add to this Argument; viz. That those who have stated the Difference between *Body* and *Spirit*, have made *Extension*, and taking up a place, and *Divisibility*, necessary to the very Being of a *Body*; and that what is not circumscribed, is incorporeal.

Claud. Ma-
mert. de Statu
Animæ. l. 1. c.
3. 17, 18. l. 3.
c. 14.

P. Methinks your Arguments run out to a great length. I pray bring them into a less compass.

Pr. I proceed to a Third Argument from the *Fathers*, which will not take up much time; and that is, That the *Fathers* knew nothing of the *Subsistence of Accidents without their Substance*, without which *Transubstantiation* cannot be maintained: And therefore in the *Roman Schools*, the possibility of *Accidents* subsisting without their *Subjects*, is defended. But on the contrary, *Maximus*, one of the eldest of the *Fathers*, who lived in the Second Century, affirms it to be of the *Essence of Accidents to be in their Substance*.

Apud. Euseb.
de Præp. E-
vangel. l. 7. c.
22.

Basil. Epist. 43. S. Basil saith, *Nature doth not bear a distinction between Body and Figure, although Reason makes one.*

Isidor. Epist. 1. 2. Ep. 72. *Isidore Pelusiota, saith, That Quality cannot be without Substance.*

Greg. Nyssen. in Hexaem. p. 13. *Gregory Nyssen, That Figure cannot be without Body, and that a Body cannot be conceived without Qualities : And that if we take away Colour, and Quantity, and Resistance, the whole Notion of a Body is destroy'd. Take away Space from Bodies, saith S. Augustin, and they can be no where ; and if they can be no where, they cannot be : And so he saith, if we take away Bodies from their Qualities. And in plain terms, That no Qualities, as Colours, or Form, can remain without their Subject.*

Isid. Origin. 1. 2. c. 26. *And that no Accidents can be without their Subject, is in general affirmed by Isidore Hispalensis, Boethius, Damascen, and others, who give an Account of the Philosophy of the Ancients.*

Boeth. de Prædic. Damascen Dial. c. 1. *P: All this proceeds upon the old Philosophy of Accidents : What if there be none at all ?*

Alcuin. Dial. c. 5, 12. *Pr. What then makes the same impression on our Senses when the Substance is gone, as when it was there ? Is there a perpetual Miracle to deceive our Senses ? But it is impossible to maintain Transubstantiation, as it is defined in the Church of Rome, without Accidents : They may hold some other Doctrine in the place of it, but they cannot hold that. And that other Doctrine will be as impossible to be understood. For if once we suppose the Body of Christ to be in the Sacrament, in place of the Substance of the Bread, which appears to our Senses to be Bread still : Then suppose there be no Accidents, the Body of a Man must make the same impression on our Senses, which the Substance of Bread doth, which is so horrible an Absurdity, that the Philosophy of Accidents cannot imply any greater than it. So that the New Transubstantiators had as good return to the Old Mumpsimus of Accidents.*

P. I suppose you have now done with this Argument.

Pr. No: I have something farther to say about it, which is, that the Fathers do not only assert, *That Accidents cannot be without their Subject*, but they confute Hereticks on that Supposition; which shew'd their assurance of the Truth of it.

Irenæus overthrows the *Valentinian Conjugations*, because Iren. l. 2. c. 14.
Truth can no more be without a Subject, than Water without Moisture, or Fire without Heat, or a Stone without Hardness; which are so joined together, that they cannot be separated.

Methodius confutes *Origen's* Fancy about the Soul having the Shape of a Body, without the Substance, because the Shape and the Body cannot be separated from each other. Apud. Phot. Cod. 234.

S. Augustin proves the *Immortality* of the Soul from hence, because meer Accidents can never be separated from the Body, so as the Mind is by abstraction. And in another place he asserts it to be a monstrous absurd Doctrine, to suppose that, whose Nature is to be in a Subject, to be capable of subsisting without it. Aug. de Immort. Anim. c. 10. Soliloq. l. 2. c. 13.

Claudianus Mamertus proves, that the Soul could not be in the Body as its Subject; for then it could not subsist when the Body is destroy'd. De Statu Anim. l. 3. c. 3.

P. I hope you have now done with this Third Argument.

Pr. Yes: and I shall wait your own time for an Answer. I go on to a Fourth: And that is from the Evidence of Sense asserted and allowed by the Fathers, with respect to the Body of Christ.

P. I expected this before now. For, as the Author of the Single Sheet observes: *This is the Cock-Argument of one of the Lights of your Church; and it so far resembles the Light, that like it, it makes a glaring shew, but go to, grasp it, and you find nothing in your hand.*

Pr. Then it's plain our Senses are deceived.

P. Not as to *Transubstantion*: for he believes more of his Senses than we do: for his Eyes tell him there is the Colour of Bread, and he assents to them; his Tongue, that it has the Taste of Bread, and he agrees to it; and so for his smelling and feeling: But then he hath a notable fetch in his Conclusion; viz. That his Ears tell him from the Words spoken by Christ himself, that it is the Body of Christ, and he believes these too. Is not here one Sense more than you believe? And yet you would perswade the World, that we do not believe our Senses.

Pr. This is admirable Stuff; but it must be tenderly dealt with. For I pray what doth he mean when he saith, he believes from Christ's own Words, that it is the Body of Christ? What is this *It*? Is it the *Accidents* he speaks of before? Are those *Accidents* then the Body of Christ? Is it the Substance of Bread? But that is not discerned by the Senses, he saith: and if it were, will he say, that the Substance of Bread is the Body of Christ? If neither of these, then his believing *It is the Body of Christ*, signifies nothing; for there can be no sense of it.

P. However, he shews, That we who believe *Transubstantiation*, do not renounce our Senses, as you commonly reproach us; For we believe all that our Senses represent to us, which is only the outward appearance. For, as he well observes, If your Eyes see the Substance of things, they are most extraordinary ones, and better than ours. For our parts, we see no farther than the Colour, or Figure, &c. of things which are only *Accidents*, and the entire Object of that Sense.

Pr. Is there no difference between the Perception of Sense, and the Evidence of Sense? We grant, that the Perception of our Senses goes no farther than to the outward *Accidents*; but that Perception affords such an Evidence by which the Mind doth pass judgment upon the thing represented by the outward Sense. I pray tell me, have you any certainty there

is such a thing as a *material Substance* in the World?

P. Yes.

Pr. Whence comes the certainty of the *Substance*, since your Senses cannot discover it? Do we live among nothing but *Accidents*? Or can we know nothing beyond them?

P. I grant we may know in general that there are such things as *Substances* in the World.

Pr. But can we not know the difference of *one Substance* from another, by our Senses? As for instance, can we not know a Man from a Horse, or an Elephant from a Mouse, or a piece of Bread from a Church? Or do we only know there are such and such *Accidents* belong to every one of these; but our Senses are not so *extraordinary* to discover the *Substances* under them? I pray answer me one Question, Did you ever keep *Lent*?

P. What a strange Question is this? Did you not tell me you would avoid Impertinencies?

Pr. This is none, I assure you.

P. Then I answer, I think my self obliged to keep it.

Pr. Then you thought your self bound to abstain from *Flesh*, and to eat *Fish*.

P. What of all that?

Pr. Was it the *Substance* of *Flesh* you abstained from, or only the *Accidents* of it?

P. The *Substance*?

Pr. And did you know the difference between the *Substance* of *Flesh* and *Fish* by your *Tast*?

P. Yes.

Pr. Then you have an *extraordinary Tast*, which goes to the *very Substance*?

P. But this is off from our Business, which was about the *Fathers*, and not our own *Judgment* about the *Evidence of Sense*.

Pr. I am ready for you upon that Argument. And I only desire to know whether you think the *Evidence of Sense* suffi-

sufficient, as to the *true Body of Christ*, where it is supposed to be present?

P. By no means; For then we could not believe it to be present, where we cannot perceive it.

P. But the Fathers did assert the Evidence of Sense to be sufficient, as to the true Body of Christ; so *Irenæus*,
 Iren. l. 3. 20: 5-7. *Tertullian*, *Epiphanius*, *Hilary*, and *St. Augustin*. I will
 Tertul. de Carne Christi, c. 5. produce their Words at length, if you desire them.
 Advers. Marc. l. 4. c. 43. l. 3. c. 8. 11. *Epiphanius*. hær. 42, 64. *Hilary*. in Psal. 137. *Augustine*. c. Faust. l. 29. c. 2.
 l. 14. c. 10. 83. *Quæst.* c. 14. *Serm.* 238.

P. It will be but lost labour, since we deny not, as
 Cardinal *Bellarmin* well saith, *The Evidence of Sense* to
 De Euch. l. 1. c. 14. be a good positive Evidence, but not a negative, i. e. that it
 is a Body, which is handled, and felt, and seen; but not, that
 it is no Body which is not.

Pr. Very well! And I pray then what becomes of your
single Sheet-man, who so confidently denies *Sense* to be good
 positive Evidence as to a real Body; but only as to the outward
 appearance?

P. You mistake him; for he saith, *We are to believe our
 Senses, where they are not indisposed, and no Divine Revela-
 tion intervenes*, which we believe there doth in this Case;
 and therefore, unless the Fathers speak of the Sacrament,
 we have no reason to regard their Testimonies in this mat-
 ter. But we have stronger Evidence against you from the
 Fathers, for they say we are not to rely on the Evidence
 of Sense, as to the Sacrament. So *St. Cyril*, *St. Chrysostom*,
 and *St. Ambrose*.

Pr. I am glad you offer any thing which deserves to be
 considered. But have you already forgot *Bellarmin's* Rule,
 that *Sense* may be a good positive Evidence, but not a nega-
 tive, i. e. it may discover what is present as a Body, but not
 what is not, and cannot be so present, viz. the Invisible
 Grace which goes along with it; and as to this the Fathers
 might well say, we are not to trust our Sense. P. This

P. This is making an Interpretation for them.

Pr. No such matter. It is the proper and genuine Sense of their Words; as will appear from hence.

(1.) They assert the very same, as to the *Chrism* and *Baptism*, which they do as to the *Eucharist*.

(2.) That which they say, our *Senses* cannot reach, is something of a *spiritual Nature*, and not a *Body*. And here the Case is extremely different from the Judgment of Sense, as to a *material Substance*. And if you please, I will evidently prove from the *Fathers*, that that wherein they excluded the Judgment of Sense in the *Eucharist*, was something wholly *Spiritual* and *Immaterial*.

P. No, no, we have been long enough upon the *Fathers*, unless their Evidence were more certain one way or other. For my part, I believe on the account of Divine Revelation in this matter, *This is my Body*; here I stick, and the *Fathers* agreed with us herein, that *Christ's words* are not to be taken in a figurative Sense.

Pr. The contrary hath been so plainly proved in a late excellent Discourse of *Transubstantiation*, that I wonder none of your Party have yet undertaken to answer it; but they write on, as if no such Treatise had appear'd. I shall therefore wave all the Proofs that are there produced, till some tolerable Answer be given to them.

P. Methinks you have taken a great Liberty of talking about the *Fathers*, as tho they were all on your side; but our late Authors assure us the contrary; and I hope I may now make use of them, to shew that *Transubstantiation* was the Faith of the Ancient Church.

Pr. With all my heart, I am long to hear what they can say in a matter; I think, so clear on our side.

P. Well Sir, I begin with the *Consensus Veterum*, written by one that professed himself a *Minister* of the Church of England.

Pr. Make

Cyril. Mystag.
3. & 4. 5.
Catech. 3.
Chrysost. in
Matt. hom. 83.
Ambros. de his
qui initiatur,
c. 9.

Pr. Make what you can of him, now you have him; but I will meddle with no personal Things, I desire to hear his Arguments.

Consensus Veterum, p. 21, 22, 23.

P. What say you to *R. Selomo*, interpreting the 72. *Psal.* v. 16. *Of Wafers in the days of the Messias*; to *R. Moses Haddarian*, on *Gen.* 39. 1. and on *Psal.* 136. 25. to *R. Cahana*, on *Gen.* 49. 1. who was long before the Nativity of Christ; *R. Johai*, on *Numb.* 28. 2. and to *R. Judas*, who was many years before Christ came.

Pr. Can you hold your Countenance when you repeat these things? But any thing must pass from a *New Convert*. What think you of *R. Cahana*, and *R. Judas*, who lived so long before our Saviour, when we know that the *Jews* have no Writings preserved near to our Saviours time, besides the Bible, and some say the *Paraphrasts* upon it. I would have been glad to have seen these Testimonies taken from their Original Authors, and not from *Galatinus*, who is known to have been a notorious Plagiary, as to the main of his Book, and of little or no Credit as to the rest. But it is ridiculous to produce the Testimonies of *Jewish Rabbins* for *Transubstantiation*, when it is so well known that it is one of their greatest objections against *Christianity*, as taught in the *Roman Church*, as may be seen in *Joseph Albo*, and others. But what is all this to the Testimony of the *Christian Fathers*?

P. Will not you let a Man shew a little *Jewish Learning*, upon occasion? But if you have a mind to the Fathers, you shall have enough of them; for I have a large Catalogue of them to produce, from the *Consensus Veterum*, *Nubes Testium*, and the single Sheet, which generally agree.

Pr. With *Coccius* or *Bellarmin*, you mean; but before you produce them, I pray tell me what you intend to prove by them?

P. The Doctrine of our Church.

Pr. As to what?

P. What

P. What have we been about all this while?

Pr. *Transubstantiation*. Will you prove that?

P. Why, do you suspect me before I begin?

Pr. I have some Reason for it. Let us first agree what we mean by it. Do you mean the same which the Church of *Rome* doth by it, in the *Council of Trent*?

P. What can we mean else?

Pr. Let us first see what that is. The *Council of Trent* declares, *That the same Body of Christ, which is in Heaven, is really, truly and substantially present in the Eucharist after Consecration, under the Species of Bread and Wine. And the Roman Catechism saith, It is the very Body which was born of the Virgin, and sits at the right hand of God. (2.) That the Bread and Wine after Consecration, lose their proper Substances, and are changed into that very Substance of the Body of Christ. And an Anathema is denounced against those who affirm the contrary. Now if you please, proceed to your proofs.*

P. I begin with the ancient *Liturgies of St. Peter, St. James, and St. Matthew.* Confess. Vet. p. 27.

Pr. Are you in earnest?

P. Why; what is the matter?

Pr. Do not you know, that these are rejected as *Supposititious*, by your own Writers? And a very late and learned Dr. of the *Sorbon*, hath given full and clear Evidences of it. Nouvelle Biblioth. des Antiques Ecclesiastiques par Elies du Pin. 1686.

P. Suppose they are, *Yet they may be of Antiquity enough, to give some competent Testimony as to Tradition.*

Pr. No such matter; For he proves *St. Peters Liturgy*, to be later than the *Sacramentary of St. Gregory*; and so can prove nothing for the first 600 years; and the *Ethio-* P. 22.
pick Liturgy, or *St. Matthews*, he shews to be very late. That of *St. James*, he thinks to have been sometime before the *Five General Councils*; but by no means to have been *St. James's.* P. 23.

E

P. What

P. What think you of the *Acts of St. Andrew*, and
 Confens. p. 30. what he saith therein, *about eating the Flesh of Christ*?

Pr. I think he saith nothing to the purpose. But I am ashamed to find one, who hath so long been a Minister in this Church, so extremely ignorant, as to bring these for good *Authorities*, which are rejected with scorn by all Men of Learning and Ingenuity among you.

P. I am afraid you grow angry.

Pr. I confess *Ignorance* and *Confidence* together, are very provoking things; especially, when a Man in years pretends to leave our Church on such pitiful Grounds.

P. But he doth produce better *Authorities*.

Pr. If he doth, they are not to his purpose.

P. That must be tried; What say you to *Ignatius*? I hope you allow his *Epistles*?

Pr. I see no reason to the contrary. But what saith he?

P. He saith, *That some Hereticks then would not receive the Eucharist and Oblations, because they will not confess the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Saviour Christ.* And this is produced by both Authors.

Confens. Veter.
 p. 30.
 Nubes Testi-
 um, p. 109.

Pr. The Persons *Ignatius* speaks of, were such as denied Christ to have any true Body, and therefore, did forbear the *Eucharist*, because it was said to be his Body. And in what ever Sense it were taken, it still supposed that which they denied, viz. that he had a true Body: For, if it were figuratively understood, it was as contrary to their Doctrine, as if it were literally. For a *Figure* must relate to a real Body, as *Tertullian* argued in this Case. And *Ignatius* in the same *Epistle*, mentions the trial Christ made of his true Body, by the Senses of his Disciples, *Take hold of me, and handle me, and see, for I am no incorporeal Dæmon; and immediately they touched him, and were convinced.* Which happen'd but a few days after Christ had said, *This is my Body*; and our Saviour gave a Rule for judging a true Body, from an appearance, or spiritual Subitance; *A Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones,*

Tertull. c.
 Marcion. l. 4.
 c. 40.

Bones, as ye see me have. Therefore it is very improbable that *Ignatius* so soon after, should assert that Christs true and real Body was in the Eucharist, where it could be neither seen nor felt; For then he must overthrow the force of his former Argument. And to what purpose did Christ say, *That a Spirit had not Flesh and Bones, as they saw him to have*; if a Body of Christ might be so much after the manner of a Spirit, as tho it had Flesh and Bones, yet they could not possibly be discerned? But after all, suppose *Ignatius* doth speak of the Substance of Christs Flesh, as present in the *Eucharist*; yet he saith not a word of the *changing of the Substance* of the Bread into the *Substance of Christs Body*; which was the thing to be proved.

P. But *Justin Martyr* doth speak of the change, and his Words are produced by all three. And they are thus rendered in the single Sheet. *For we do not receive this as common Bread, or common Drink, but as by the Word of God, Jesus Christ our Redeemer being made Man, had both Flesh and Blood for our Salvation; so also, we are taught that this Food, by which our Blood and Flesh are by a change nourished, being consecrated by the Power of the Word, is the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ incarnate: What say you to this?* Apol. 2.

Pr. I desire you to consider these things. (1.) That *Justin Martyr* doth not say, That the Bread and Wine are by Consecration changed into the *Individual Flesh and Blood, in which Christ was Incarnate*; but that, *as by the Power of the Word, Christ once had a Body in the Womb of the Virgin*; so by the Power of the same Word, upon Consecration, the Bread and Wine do become the *Flesh and Blood of Christ Incarnate*; so that he must mean a parallel, and not the same *Individual Body*, i. e. that as the *Body* in the *Womb* became the *Body of Christ* by the *Power of the Holy Spirit*; so the *Holy Spirit* after Consecration, makes the Elements

to become the Flesh and Blood of Christ, not by an *Hypostatical Union*, but by *Divine Influence*, as the Church is the Body of Christ. And this was the true Notion of the Ancient Church, as to this matter, and the expressions in the *Greek Liturgies*, to this day confirm the same. (2.) He doth not in the least imply that the *Elements* by this change do lose their *Substance*; for he mentions the *nourishment of our Bodies* by it; but he affirms, that notwithstanding their Substance remain, yet the *Divine Spirit of Christ*, by its Operation, doth make them become his Body. For we must observe, that he attributes the Body in the Womb, and on the Altar, to the same λόγος, or *Divine Word*. For he did not think *Hypostatical Union* necessary, to make the Elements become the Body of Christ, but a *Divine Energy* was sufficient, as the Bodies assumed by Angels are their Bodies, tho there be no such vital Union, as there is between the Soul and Body of a Man.

P. 31.

Iren. l. 4 c. 34.

P. I go on to *Irenæus*, from whom two places are produced, one by the *Consensus Veterum*, where he saith, *That which is Bread from the Earth, perceiving the call of God, now is not common Bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, one Earthly, and the other Spiritual.*

Pr. Very well! Then there is an *Earthly*, as well as a *Spiritual thing* in the *Eucharist*, i. e. a *Bodily Substance*, and *Divine Grace*.

P. No; he saith, *The Earthly is the Accidents.*

Pr. Doth *Irenæus* say so?

P. No; but he means so.

Pr. There is not a word to that purpose in *Irenæus*; and therefore this is downright Prevarication. I grant *Irenæus* doth suppose a change made by *Divine Grace*; but not by *destroying the Elements*, but by *super-adding Divine Grace* to them; and so the *Bread* becomes the *Body of Christ*, and the *Wine* his *Blood*.

P. The

P. The other place in *Irenæus* is, where he saith, *That as* Iren 1. 5. c. 11.
the Bread receiving the Word of God; is made the Eucharist,
which is the Body and Blood of Christ; so also our Bodies being
nourished by it, and laid in the Earth, and there dissolved, will a-
rise at their time, &c.

Pr. What do you prove from this place?

P. That the same Divine Power is seen in making the Eucharist the Body and Blood of Christ, which is to be in the Resurrection of the Body.

Pr. But doth this prove, that the Substance of the Bread is changed into the Substance of Christ's Body?

P. Why not?

Pr. I will give you a plain Argument against it; for he saith, *Our Bodies are nourished by the Body and Blood of Christ.* Do you think that *Irenæus* believed the substance of Christ's Body was turned into the substance of our Bodies, in order to their nourishment? No; he explained himself just before in the same place; *De Calice qui est Sanguis ejus, nutritur; & de pane qui est Corpus ejus augetur*: So that he attributes the nourishment to the Bread and Wine; and therefore must suppose the substance of them to remain, since it is impossible a substantial nourishment should be made by meer Accidents. And withal, observe, he saith expressly, *That the Bread is the Body of Christ*; which your best Writers (such as *Belarmin, Suarez* and *Vasquez*) say, is inconsistent with Transubstantiation.

P. My next Author is *Tertullian*, who is produced by the *Consensus Veterum*, and the *Single Sheet*, but omitted by the *Nubes Testium*; but the other proves, that Bread which was the Figure of Christ's Body in the Old Testament, now in the New, is changed into the real and true Body of Christ.

Pr. This is a bold Attempt upon *Tertullian*, to prove, that by the Figure of Christ's Body, he means his true and real Body. For his Words are, *Acceptum panem & distribu-*

Cont. Marcion.
 l. 4. c. 40.

tum

tum Discipulis Corpus illum suum fecit, Hoc est Corpus meum dicendo, id est, Figura Corporis mei. He took the bread, and gave it to his Disciples, and made it his Body, saying, This is my Body; i. e. this is the Figure of my Body. How can those men want Proofs, that can draw Transubstantiation from these Words, which are so plain against it?

P. You are mistaken; Tertullian by Figure, meant, it was a Figure in the Old Testament, but it was now his real Body.

Pr. You put very odd Figures upon Tertullian: I appeal to any reasonable man, whether by the latter words he doth not explain the former? For he puts the Sense upon Corpus meum, by adding dicendo to them; i. e. This is the meaning of that speech, when he called the bread his body.

P. Doth not Tertullian say, That it had not been the Figure, unless it had been the Truth?

Pr. This is again perverting his words, which are, Figuratum non fuisset nisi veritatis esset Corpus; i. e. there had been no place for a Figure of Christ's Body, unless Christ had a true body. For he was proving against Marcion, that Christ had a true body; and among other Arguments he produces this from the Figure of his Body, which he not only mentions here, but in other places; where he saith, That Christ gave the Figure of his body to the bread; which cannot relate to any Figure of the Old Testament.

Cont. Marcion.
l. 3. c. 19. l. 5. c. 8.

P. But doth not Tertullian say afterwards, That the bread was the figure of Christ's body in the Old Testament?

Pr. What then? He had Two Designs against Marcion; one to prove, that Christ had a true body, which he doth here from the figure of his body: and the other, that there was a Correspondency of both Testaments: and for that purpose he shews, that the bread in Jeremiah, was the Figure of Christ's body.

P. But the Author of the Single Sheet, cites another place of Tertullian, where he saith, that our flesh feeds on the body and blood of Christ, that our soul may be filled with God.

De Refur. c. 3.

Pr. By

Pr. By the *body and blood of Christ*, he means there, the *Elements*, with *Divine Grace* going along with them; as appears by his design, which is, to shew how the *body and soul* are joyned together in *Sacramental Rites*. The *flesh* is washed, and the *soul* is cleansed; the *flesh* is anointed, and the *soul* consecrated; the *flesh* is signed, and the *soul* confirmed; the *flesh* hath hands laid upon it, and the *soul* enlighten'd; the *flesh* feeds on the *body and blood of Christ*, that the *soul* may be filled with *God*. Now unless *Tertullian* meant the *Elements*, the *Parallel* doth not proceed; for all the rest are spoken of the *external Symbols*; and so this doth not at all contradict what he saith elsewhere, no more than the *Passage* in the 2d Book *ad Uxorem* doth. For there he speaks of *Christ*, with respect to the *invisible Grace*, as he doth here, as to the *outward Symbols*.

P. Clemens Alexandrinus saith, That *Melchisedeck* gave *Strom.* 4. *Bread and wine* in figure of the *Eucharist*.

Pr. And what then? What is this to *Transubstantiation*?

P. Origen saith, *When you eat and drink the body and blood of our Lord, then our Lord enters under your roof, &c.* Hom. 5. in dī-
vers. loc.

Pr. Are you sure that *Origen* said this? But suppose he did, must he enter with *his flesh and bones*, and not much rather by a *peculiar presence of his Grace*? For is it not *Origen* who so carefully distinguishes the *typical and symbolical body of Christ*, from the *Divine Word*, and so expressly mentions the *material part of the Elements after Consecration, which pass into the Draught, &c.*? Is all this meant of the *Accidents* only? Comment. in
Matth. 15.

P. What say you to *S. Cyprian de Cæna Domini*?

Pr. I beg your pardon, Sir; this is now known and acknowledged to be a late Author, in comparison, and cannot come within your 600. years; and therefore is not ancient enough to be considered.

P. But

Cypr.de lapsis. P. But in his genuine Writings he speaks of *those who offer'd Violence to the body and blood of our Lord in the Eucharist.*

Epist. 63. N. 6. Pr. And I pray what follows? That *the substance of the Elements* is gone: Where lies the Consequence? But S. Cyprian saith, *the bread was his body, and the wine his blood*; therefore their *substance* must remain.

P. What say you to *Eusebius Emesenus*?

Pr. That he is not within our compass; and withal, that he is a known Counterfeit.

P. I perceive you are hard to please.

Pr. You say very true, as to *supposititious Writers.*

P. I hope you have more Reverence for the *Council of Nice.*

Pr. But where doth that speak of *Transubstantiation*?

P. It calls the *Eucharist the body of Christ.*

Pr. And so doth the *Church of England*; therefore that holds *Transubstantiation.* I pray bring no more such Testimonies, which prove nothing but what we hold.

P. I perceive you have a mind to cut me short.

Pr. Not in the least, where you offer any thing to the purpose. But I pray spare those who only affirm, that the *Eucharist is the body and blood of Christ after Consecration.* For I acknowledg it was the Language of the Church, especially in the 4th Century, when the *Names* of the *Elements* were hardly mention'd to the *Catechumens*; and all the Discourses of the Fathers to them, tended to heighten the Devotion and Esteem of the Eucharist. By which Observation you may easily understand the meaning of the Eloquent Writers of that Age, who speak with so much *Mystery and Obscurity* about it. If you have any that go beyond lofty expressions and Rhetorical flights, I pray produce them.

P. I perceive you are afraid of S. Greg. Nazianzen, and S. Basil, but especially S. Chrysostom, you fence so much beforehand against Eloquent Men.

Pr. As

Pr. As to the other two, there is nothing material alledged by any to this purpose; but *S. Chrysostom*, I confess, doth speak very lofty things concerning the *Sacrament* in his popular Discourses, but yet nothing that doth prove *Transubstantiation*.

P. What think you of *his Homilies*, 51, and 83. on *S. Mat.* 46. *Homily* on *S. John* 24. *Homilie* on 1st to the *Corinth.* the *Homilies* on *Philogonius* and the *Cross*? Are there not strange things in them concerning the *Eucharist*? *About eating Christ, and seeing him lie before them slain on the Altar; about touching his body there, and the Holy Spirit, with an innumerable Host, hovering over what is there proposed, with much more to that purpose.*

*Nubes Testi-
um. p. 120. &c.
Consens. Veter.
p. 54. &c.*

Pr. You need not to recite more; for I yield that *S. Chrysostom* delighted in the highest flights of his Eloquence, on this Subject, in his *Homilies*; and he tells for what Reason, to excite the Reverence and Devotion of the People. But yet himself doth afford us a sufficient Key to these expressions, if we attend to these things concerning his manner of speaking

(1.) That he affirms those things which no side can allow to be literally understood. As when he so often speaks of *our seeing and touching Christ upon the Altar*, which is inconsistent with the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*: *For Christ is utterly invisible on the Altar, even by divine power, saith Suarez. He is invisible in the Sacrament, saith Bellarmine: and he saith also, that he cannot be touched.* What then is to be said to such expressions of *S. Chrysostom*?

*Disp. 53. Sect.
4.
De Euch. l. 1.
c. 2.*

Behold thou seest him, thou touchest him, thou eatest him.

It is not his Sacrament only which is offer'd us to touch, but himself. What if you do not hear his voice, do you not see him lying before you?

*Hom. 83. in
Mat.
Hom. 51. in
Mat.
In Hebr. Hom.
14.
In Rom. Hom.
8.
Ad Pop. Anti-
och. Hom. 15.*

Behold Christ lying before you slain.

Christ lies on the holy Table, as a Sacrifice slain for us.

Thou swearest upon the holy Table where Christ lies slain.

De Sacerd. 13. *When thou seest our Lord lying on the Table, and the Priest praying, and the by-standers purpled with his blood.*

In Joh. Hom. 45. *See the Love of Christ; he doth not only suffer himself to be seen by those who desire it, but to be touch'd and eaten, and our Teeth to be fixed in his flesh.*

Now these expressions are on all sides granted to be literally absurd and impossible; and therefore we must say of him as *Bonaventure* once said of *S. Augustin*, *Plus dicit sanctus & minus vult intelligi*; We must make great allowance for such expressions, or you must hold a *Capernaïtical Sense*.

And it is denied by your selves, that *Christ is actually slain upon the Altar*; and therefore you yield, that such expressions are to be figuratively understood.

(2.) That he lets fall many things in such Discourses which do give light to the rest: As,

Hom. in Gal. c. 5. (1.) *That Flesh is improperly taken when applied to the Eucharist.*

Hom de Resur. To. 5. (2.) *He calls the Sacrament the mystical body and blood of Christ.*

Hom. 46. in Joh. (3.) *That the eating of Christ's flesh is not to be understood literally, but spiritually.*

Hom. 28. in 1. Ep. ad Corinth. (4.) *He opposes Christ's sacramental presence, and real corporal presence to each other.*

Hom. 24. in 1. ad Corinth. (5.) *He still exhorts the Communicants to look upwards towards Heaven.*

Hom. 22. in Hebr. And now if you lay these things together, this Eloquent Father will not, with all his Flights, come near to Transubstantiation.

Hom. de Pœnit. To. 6. P. No! In one place he asserts the substance of the Elements to be lost.

Pr. Thanks to the *Latin* Translators, for the *Greek* Word *κατακαίω* as the *Criticks* observe, doth not signifie to destroy; but to refine, and purifie a Substance. But I do not rely upon this; for the plain answer is, that *S. Chrysostom* doth not there speak of the Elements upon Consecration, but what becomes of

of them, after they are taken down into the Stomack. S. Chrysostom thought it would lessen the Peoples Reverence and Devotion, if they passed into the draught, as Origen affirmed; and therefore he started another Opinion; viz. *That as Wax, when it is melted in the fire, throws off no superfluities, but it passes indiscernably away; so the Elements, or Mysteries, as he calls them, pass imperceptibly into the substance of the body, and so are consumed together with it.* Therefore, saith he, approach with Reverence, not supposing that you receive the divine body from a Man, but as with Tongs of Fire from the Seraphims: Which the Author of the *Consensus Veterum* translates, *but Fire from the Tongues of Seraphims.* S. Chrysostom's Words are, *ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν τῶν Σεραφίμ τῷ λαβίδι τῷ πυρὶ:* And the Sense is, *that the divine body (i. e. the Eucharist, after Consecration, being by the divine spirit made the divine body, as in S. Chrysostom's Liturgy, there is a particular Prayer for the Holy Ghost to come, and so make the bread to be the divine body, or the holy body of Christ), is to be taken, not with our Mouths, which can only receive the Elements, but after a divine manner, as with Tongs of fire from Seraphims; by which he expresses the spiritual acts of Faith and Devotion, as most agreeable to that divine spirit which makes the Elements to become the holy body of Christ.* But that S. Chrysostom did truly and firmly believe the substance of the bread to remain after Consecration, I have already proved from his Epistle to Cæsarius.

P. 56.

Eucholog. p.
77.

P. I pray let us not go backward, having so much ground to run over still.

Pr. I am content, if you will produce only those who speak of the *change of substance*, and not such as only mention the *body and blood of Christ after Consecration*, which I have already told you, was the Language of the Church; and therefore all those Testimonies are of no force in this matter.

Greg. Nyssen.
Orat. Catech.
37.

P. Then I must quit the greatest part of what remains, as Optatus, Gaudenius, S. Jerom, and others; but I have some still left which will set you hard. What say you then to Gregory Nyssen, who saith, *the sanctified bread is changed into the body of the Word of God*. And he takes off your Answer of a *mystical body*; for he puts the Question, *how the same body can daily be distributed to the faithful throughout the World, it remaining whole and entire in it self?*

Pr. Gregory Nyssen was a Man of Fancy, and he shewed it in that Catechetical Discourse: However, Fronto Ducæus thought it a notable place to prove Transubstantiation, which I wonder at, if he attended to the Design of it; which was to shew, that as our bodies, by eating, became subject to Corruption, so by eating they become capable of Immortality; and this he saith, *must be by receiving an immortal body into our bodies, such as the body of Christ was*: But then, saith he, *how could that body, which is to remain whole in it self, be distributed to all the faithful over the whole Earth?* He answers, by saying, *That our Bodies do consist of Bread and Wine, which are their proper nourishment; and Christs Body being like ours, that was so too; which by the Union with the Word of God, was changed into a Divine Dignity*. But what is this to the Eucharist, you may say? He goes on therefore, *so I believe the sanctified Bread, by the power of the Word of God, to be changed into the Body of God the Word*. Not into that Individual Body, but after the same manner, by a Presence of the $\alpha\gamma\theta$, or God the Word in it; and that this was his meaning, doth evidently appear by what follows. For, saith he, *that Body, viz. to which he was Incarnate, was sanctified by the Inhabitation of the $\alpha\gamma\theta$, dwelling in the Flesh; therefore, as the Bread was then changed into a Divine Dignity in the Body, so it is now; and the Bread is changed into the Body of the $\alpha\gamma\theta$, (not of Jesus Christ) as it was said by the Word, This is my Body*. And so by receiving this Divine Body into our bodies, they are made capable of Immortality.

talities. And this is the true Account of Gregory Nyssen's meaning, which if it prove any thing, proves an *Impanation*, rather than *Transubstantiation*.

P. But Hilary's Testimony cannot be so avoided; who saith, *That we as truly eat Christ's Flesh in the Sacrament, as he was truly Incarnate; and that we are to judg of this, not By carnal Reason, but by the Words of Christ, who said, My Flesh is meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed.* Nubes Testi-
um, p. 124.

Pr. I do not deny this to be Hilary's Sense. But yet this proves nothing like to *Transubstantiation*. For it amounts to no more than a *real Presence* of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament; and you can make no Argument from hence, unless you can prove that the Body of Christ cannot be present, unless the *Substance* of the Bread be destroy'd, which is more than can be done, or than Hilary imagin'd. All that he aimed at, was to prove a *real Union* between Christ and his People, *That Christ was in them more than by meer consent*; and to prove this, he lays hold of those words of our Saviour, *My Flesh is meat indeed, &c.* But the substantial Change of the Bread into the Substance of Christ's Body, signifies nothing to his purpose; and *Belarmin* never so much as mentions Hilary in his proofs of *Transubstantiation*, but only for the *real Presence*. But I must add something more, viz. that Hilary was one of the first who drew any Argument from the *literal Sense* of John 6. I do not say, who did by way of *Accommodation*, apply them to the Sacrament, which others might do before him. But yet, there are some of the eldest Fathers, who do wholly exclude a literal Sense, as *Tertullian* look'd on it, *As an Absurdity that Christ should be thought truly to give his Flesh to eat. Quasi vere carnem suam illis edendam determinasset.* And *Origen* saith, *It is a killing Letter, if those Words be literally understood.* But this is to run into another debate, whereas our Business is about *Transubstantiation*. If you have any more, let us now examine their Testimonies.

Tertul. de Resur. carn. c. 37.
Orig. hom. 7. in Levit.

P. What

P. What say you then to *St. Ambrose*, who speaks home to the Business, for he makes *the Change to be above Nature, and into the Body of Christ, born of the Virgin*: There are long Citations out of him, but in these words lies the whole strength of them?

*Ambros de his
qui initiantur,
c. 9.*

Pr. I answer, several things for clearing of his meaning. (1.) That *St. Ambrose* doth parallel *the Change* in the *Eucharist*, with that in *Baptism*; and to prove *Regeneration therein*, he argues from the *miraculous Conception of Christ in the Womb of the Virgin*; but in *Baptism* no body supposes the *Substance* of the *Water* to be taken away; and therefore it cannot hold as to the other, from the *supernatural Change*, which may be only with respect to such a *Divine Influence*, which it had not before *Consecration*. (2.) He doth purposely talk obscurely and mystically about this matter, as the *Fathers* were wont to do to those, who were to be admitted to these *Mysteries*. Sometimes one would think he meant that the *Elements* are changed into *Christs Individual Body born of the Virgin*; and yet presently after, he distinguishes between the *true Flesh of Christ, which was crucified and buried, and the Sacrament of his Flesh*. If this were the same, what need any distinction? And that this *Sacramentum Carnis*, is meant of the *Eucharist*, is plain by what follows; for he cites *Christs words, This is my Body*. (3.) He best explains his own meaning, when he saith, not long after, *That the Body of Christ in the Sacrament, is a spiritual Body, or a Body produced by the Divine Spirit*; and so he parallels it with *that spiritual Food, which the Israelites did eat in the Wilderness*: And no man will say, that the *Substance* of the *Manna* was then lost. And since your Authors make the same *St. Ambrose*, to have written the Book *De Sacramentis*, there is a notable passage therein, which helps to explain this; for there he saith expressly, *Non iste Panis est qui vadit in Corpus, sed ille Panis Vitæ Eternæ qui animæ nostræ Substantiam fulcit. It is not the Bread which passes*

*De Sacram. l.
5. c. 4.*

passes into the Body, but the Bread of Eternal Life, which strengthens the Substance of our Soul. Where he not only calls it Bread after Consecration, which goes to our Nourishment; but he distinguishes it from the Bread of Eternal Life, which supports the Soul, which must be understood of Divine Grace, and not of any Bodily Substance.

P. I perceive you will not leave us one Father of the whole number?

Pr. Not one. And I hope this gives an incomparable Advantage to the Doctrine of the *Trinity* in point of *Tradition*, above *Transubstantiation*; when I have not only proved, that the greatest of the Fathers expressly denied it, but that there is not one in the whole number who affirmed it. For altho there were some difference in the way of explaining how the Eucharist was the Body and Blood of Christ; yet not one of them hitherto produced, doth give any countenance to your Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, which the Council of *Trent* declared to have been the constant belief of the Church in all Ages; which is so far from being true, that there is as little ground to believe that, as *Transubstantiation* it self. And so much as to this Debate, concerning the comparing the Doctrine of the *Trinity* and *Transubstantiation*, in point of *Tradition*; if you have any thing to say further, as to *Scripture* and *Reason*, I shall be ready to give you Satisfaction the next Opportunity.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

Page 11. Margin l. 9. r. *ἐπισφραγισ*. l. 13. Marg. l. 7. r. *Ἀναστροφῇ*.

Books Printed for W. Rogers.

THe Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome* truly Represented; in Answer to a Book intituled, A Papist Mis-represented and Represented, &c. Quarto.

An Answer to a Discourse intituled, Papists Protesting against Protestant Popery; being a Vindication of Papists not Misrepresented by Protestants: and containing a particular Examination of Monsieur *de Meaux*, late Bishop of *Condom*, his Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, in the Articles of Invocation of Saints, and the Worship of Images, occasioned by that Discourse. Quarto.

An Answer to the Amicable Accommodation of the Difference between the Representer and Answerer. Quarto.

A View of the whole Controversy between the Representer and the Answerer, with an Answer to the Representer's last Reply; in which are laid open some of the Methods by which Protestants are Misrepresented by Papists. Quarto.

A Discourse against Transubstantiation, in 8vo. price 3d.

Bishop *Wilkins's* Fifteen Sermons. Octavo.

Sermons and Discourses, some of which never before printed, the third Volume. By the Reverend Dr. *Tillotson* Dean of *Canterbury*. Octavo.

A Manual for a Christian Soldier. Written by *Erasmus*, and Translated into English. Twelves.